UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,501	01/23/2006	Youenn Fablet	01807.108868.	2063

5514   7590   06/24/2009
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
RUTLEDGE, AMELIA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/565,501	FABLET, YOUENN
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AMELIA RUTLEDGE	2176	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 January 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>23 January 2006</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *See Continuation Sheet.*

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   **Office Action Summary**   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20090619

Continuation of Attachment(s) 3). Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08), Paper No(s)/Mail Date :04/28/2006; 02/21/2008;07/25/2008.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the following communications: original application,

filed 01/23/2006; preliminary Amendment, filed 01/23/2006; Information Disclosure

Statements, filed 04/28/2006; 02/21/2008;07/25/2008.

2.   Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 24, and 25 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of
matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the
conditions and requirements of this title.

**Claim 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is

directed to non-statutory subject matter.**

Regarding independent claim 24, claim 24 recites a "Data medium readable by

a computer system..." The specification defines a "data medium readable by a

computer system" as "a transmittable medium, such as an electrical or optical signal..."

Therefore, the claimed data medium does not fall under a statutory category of

invention and is directed to non-statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101 because

the claimed invention is not limited to computer hardware.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mor, U.S. Patent No. 7,210,095 B1, issued April 2007, in view of Villard, "Authoring Transformations by Direct Manipulation for Adaptable Multimedia Presentations", Proceedings of the 2001 ACM Symposium on Document Engineering, published 2001, p. 125-134.

Regarding independent claim 1, Mor suggests and teaches *a method of processing at least one digital graphical document represented in a predetermined markup language in which at least one software display program of browser type is used for displaying such a document, the method comprising the following steps: i) transforming the original document displayed in read mode into an editable version in the markup language according to a set of predefined transformation rules, the transformation rules incorporating a set of rules for writing to the document;* because Mor teaches a SVG document, editing the SVG document, and presenting the modified SVG document, and transforming the document by associating graphical elements in the document with binding elements (Fig. 8A; 9B; col. 9, l. 32-col. 11, l. 56; col. 11, l. 60-col. 13, l. 28). Mor teaches displaying the document in a browser (col. 1, l. 15-col. 2, l. 35).

However, Mor suggests but does not explicitly teach a set of predefined transformation rules, the transformation rules incorporating a set of rules for writing to the document. Mor teaches binding elements which are used to link elements of the

document to an editor (col. 5, l. 14-43), but does not explicitly disclose that the elements incorporate "a set of rules for writing to the document". Villard teaches transforming graphical XML documents according to such a set of predefined transformation rules (p. 129-133, section 5, "Rules generation"), including a set of rules for writing to the document.

Mor teaches *ii) interacting via the software display program with the editable version in order to modify the editable version according to the set of writing rules*; because Mor teaches an example editor application to modify an editable version of the document (col. 13, l. 30-col. 14, l. 16). Villard also teaches an editable version (p. 127, Section 301).

Mor teaches *iii) transforming the editable version thus modified into a version in read mode incorporating the modifications made during step ii),* because Mor teaches a SVG document, editing the SVG document, and presenting the modified SVG document, and transforming the document by associating graphical elements in the document with binding elements (Fig. 8A; 9B; col. 9, l. 32-col. 11, l. 56; col. 11, l. 60-col. 13, l. 28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the graphical XML editing tools disclosed by Mor and Villard, since Mor disclosed a thin graphical interface for rendering SVG (col. 2, l. 10-20), which would have benefited from the adaptable transformation sheets by direct manipulation, disclosed by Villard (p. 125-126), providing the benefit of a complete authoring tool that handled any kind of XML documents (Villard, p. 127, Section 2.3).

Regarding dependent claim 2, Mor does not explicitly teach *wherein the set of predefined transformation rules are not linked to the document*, however, Villard teaches XSLT transformation sheets which are not linked to the document, p. 127-128 (Sect. 3.1 and 3.4).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the graphical XML editing tools disclosed by Mor and Villard, since Mor disclosed a thin graphical interface for rendering SVG (col. 2, l. 10-20), which would have benefited from the adaptable transformation sheets by direct manipulation, disclosed by Villard (p. 125-126), providing the benefit of a complete authoring tool that handled any kind of XML documents (Villard, p. 127, Section 2.3).

Regarding dependent claim 3, Mor teaches *wherein the software display program of browser type is capable of using the set of transformation rules for transforming the original document into an editable version*, because Mor teaches that binding elements are used to transform the original document into an editable version (col. 5, l. 14-43).

Regarding dependent claim 4, Mor teaches *wherein the reverse transformation according to step iii) is able, from an edited document, to retrieve the unedited document*, because Mor teaches binding elements which are used to edit the document but are not stored in the edited document (col. 10, l. 16-col. 12, l. 45), thereby enabling reverse transformation of the modified document by allowing retrieval of information outside the document.

   Regarding dependent claim 5, Mor teaches *wherein the direct transformation*

according to step i) is able to add guidance information capable of guiding the reverse

transformation according to step iii); because Mor teaches binding elements which are

used to edit the document but are not stored in the edited document (col. 10, l. 16-col.

12, l. 45), thereby enabling reverse transformation of the modified document by allowing

retrieval of information outside the document.

   Regarding dependent claim 6, Mor teaches *wherein the guidance information*

belongs to the group formed by elements to be removed; elements situated in the

modified document in a specific namespace; scripts updating the values of the guidance

information; instruction information relating to the creation/modification of attributes;

because Mor teaches binding elements for instruction relating to the modification of

attributes, and elements situated in a specific namespace (col. 7, l. 20-col. 9, l. 29).

   Regarding dependent claim 7, Mor teaches *wherein the direct transformation*

according to step i) is able to identify each selectable graphical element, because Mor

teaches transforming the document by associating each selectable graphical element in

the document with binding elements (Fig. 8A; 9B; col. 9, l. 32-col. 11, l. 56; col. 11, l.

60-col. 13, l. 28).

   Regarding dependent claim 8, Mor teaches *a method according to Claim 1,*

wherein the direct transformation according to step i) is able to incorporate/move nodes

written in the SVG type markup language into a non-SVG namespace in order to

deactivate the effects of the said nodes, and the reverse transformation according to

step iii) is able to retrieve the SVG nodes moved into a non- SVG namespace; because

Mor teaches an XML statement that identifies the XML namespaces used to resolve elements involving "svg" and "bind" in the document (col. 7, l. 20-32).

Regarding dependent claim 9, Mor does not explicitly teach *wherein the direct transformation according to step i) comprises a parameter capable of deciding to retain/remove an animation element*, however, Villard teaches the Madeus model of describing multimedia documents, which has parameters for composition of media objects, including animation elements (p. 127, Sect. 3.2), therefore Villard teaches the declaration of objects that belong to the presentation, i.e., deciding to retain/remove an element.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the graphical XML editing tools disclosed by Mor and Villard, since Mor disclosed a thin graphical interface for rendering SVG (col. 2, l. 10-20), which would have benefited from the adaptable transformation sheets by direct manipulation, disclosed by Villard (p. 125-126), providing the benefit of a complete authoring tool that handled any kind of XML documents (Villard, p. 127, Section 2.3).

Regarding dependent claim 10, Mor teaches *wherein the direct transformation according to step i) incorporates mutation events able to synchronously modify the document with respect to the initial document*, because Mor teaches embodiments where some of the graphical elements in the original SVG are hidden or added in the modified SVG document (col. 12, l. 15-45).

Regarding dependent claim 11, Mor teaches *wherein the direct transformation according to step i) incorporates a mechanism able to modify all or part of the edited*

document via programs available remotely from the document, because Mor teaches an

example editor application to modify an editable version of the document (col. 13, l. 30-

col. 14, l. 16).

   Regarding dependent claim 12, Mor suggests *wherein reverse transformation*

according to step iii) is able to modify an initialization script in order to save

modifications made on graphical elements created by the initialization script; in Claim 6,

where Mor claims a script mapping to the graphical representation.

   Regarding independent claim 13, Mor teaches *an apparatus for processing at*

least one digital graphical document represented in a predetermined markup language

in which at least one software display program of browser type is used for displaying

such a document, comprising: transformation means for transforming the original

document displayed in read mode into an editable version in the markup language

according to a set of predefined transformation rules, the transformation rules

incorporating a set of rules for writing to the document; because Mor teaches a SVG

document, editing the SVG document, and presenting the modified SVG document, and

transforming the document by associating graphical elements in the document with

binding elements (Fig. 8A; 9B; col. 9, l. 32-col. 11, l. 56; col. 11, l. 60-col. 13, l. 28).

Mor teaches displaying the document in a browser (col. 1, l. 15-col. 2, l. 35).

   However, Mor suggests but does not explicitly teach a set of predefined

transformation rules, the transformation rules incorporating a set of rules for writing to

the document. Mor teaches binding elements which are used to link elements of the

document to an editor (col. 5, l. 14-43), but does not explicitly disclose that the elements

incorporate "a set of rules for writing to the document". Villard teaches transforming graphical XML documents according to such a set of predefined transformation rules (p. 129-133, section 5, "Rules generation"), including a set of rules for writing to the document.

Mor teaches hardware means for displaying and transforming the document in a graphical user interface (col. 14, l. 20-col. 16, l. 13).

Mor discloses *processing means for interacting via the software display program with the editable version in order to modify the editable version according to the set of writing rules*; because Mor teaches an example editor application to modify an editable version of the document (col. 13, l. 30-col. 14, l. 16). Villard also teaches an editable version (p. 127, Section 301).

Mor discloses *reverse transformation means for transforming the editable version thus modified into a version in read mode incorporating the modifications thus made by said processing means*; because Mor teaches a SVG document, editing the SVG document, and presenting the modified SVG document, and transforming the document by associating graphical elements in the document with binding elements (Fig. 8A; 9B; col. 9, l. 32-col. 11, l. 56; col. 11, l. 60-col. 13, l. 28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the graphical XML editing tools disclosed by Mor and Villard, since Mor disclosed a thin graphical interface for rendering SVG (col. 2, l. 10-20), which would have benefited from the adaptable transformation sheets by direct manipulation,

disclosed by Villard (p. 125-126), providing the benefit of a complete authoring tool that handled any kind of XML documents (Villard, p. 127, Section 2.3).

     Regarding dependent claims 14-23, claims 14-23 are directed to the apparatus for implementing the methods as claimed in dependent claims 2 and 4-12, above, and are rejected along the same rationale.

     Regarding independent claim 24, claim 24 is directed to the data medium readable by a computer system for performing the methods as claimed in independent claim 1, above, and is rejected along a similar rationale.

     Regarding independent claim 25, claim 25 is directed to the computer readable storage medium for performing the methods as claimed in independent claim 1, above, and is rejected along a similar rationale.

Conclusion

     The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Badros, et al., "A constraint extension to scalable vector graphics", Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on World Wide Web, published 2001, p. 489-498.

Toyama et al.   U.S. Patent No. 7,146,565 B2   issued   December 2006

     Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AMELIA RUTLEDGE whose telephone number is (571)272-7508. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Amelia Rutledge/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176